

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections of the application are respectfully requested in view of the amendments and remarks herewith. The present amendment is being made to facilitate prosecution of the application. Accompanying this amendment is Applicants' Request for Continued Examination (RCE), submitted under 37 CFR 1.114.

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS AND FORMAL MATTERS

Claims 1-2, 6-14, and 18-25 are pending. Claims 1, 7, 9, 10, 12, 13, 19, 21, 22, 24 and 25 are amended. Claims 1 and 13 are independent. Support for this amendment is provided throughout the Specification as originally filed, and particularly at the paragraph bridging pages 9 and 10, the last paragraph on page 10, pages 12-14, and page 19, lines 9-13.

No new matter has been introduced by this amendment. Changes to the claims are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. §101, §102, §103, or §112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification.

II. REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1, 7-9, 13, and 19-21 were rejected once again under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,838,383 (Chimoto) in view of U.S. Patent 5,617,541 (Albanese).

Claims 2, 10-12, 14, and 22-25 were rejected once again under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chimoto in view of Albanese and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,469,742 (Trovato).

Claims 6 and 18 were rejected once again under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Chimoto in view of Albanese, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,198,479 (Humbleman).

It is respectfully submitted, Chimoto does not mention a processing unit included in each digital processing block, as asserted by the Examiner in section 3 of the Office Action under reply. Moreover, although Chimoto transfers operating parameters, these are not high layer commands. Furthermore, such operating parameters are dependent on hardware, which is the very opposite of the high layer commands recited by independent claims 1 and 13 of the instant application. As seen from, for example, Fig. 33 of Chimoto, and described at col. 37, lines 31-37 (the portion of Chimoto particularly referenced by the Examiner), the operating parameters that are transferred are transferred on a real time basis. This is contrasted with the high layer commands outputted by the host processing block of Applicants' claim 1, which is not on a real time basis and which is not dependent on hardware structure.

The foregoing distinguishing features of Applicants' claim 1 are particularly recited in the claim as follows:

... each of said plurality of digital signal processing blocks having a processing unit and cooperating with hardware;

a host processing block for controlling said digital signal processing apparatus by outputting to a respective digital signal processing block a command of a high layer, not dependent on hardware structure and not on a real time basis; and

a common bus for connecting said host processing block and said plurality of digital signal processing blocks together for transferring via said common bus both said command that is not on a real time basis and said high speed streams of data.

It is respectfully submitted, the addition of Albanese, which was relied upon to meet a feature no longer recited in claim 1, fails to cure the aforesaid omission of Chimoto.

Therefore, it is urged that claim 1 is patentably distinct over the combination of Chimoto and Albanese; and the withdrawal of the rejection of this claim is respectfully requested.

Claim 13 is directed to the method performed by the apparatus of claim 1 and recites substantially the same features that, as discussed above, are not suggested by Chimoto, even if Chimoto is combined with Albanese. Therefore, for the reasons argued above, the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13 is respectfully requested.

The remaining claims depend either from claim 1 or from claim 13. Since these dependent claims therefore include all of the recitations found in the claim from which they depend, and since such recitations find no correspondence in the combination of Chimoto and Albanese, it follows that the dependent claims are patentably distinct over these references for the very same reasons argued above.

In addition, it is respectfully submitted that dependent claims 6 and 18 are further distinct over the combination of Chimoto, Albanese and Humpleman (used to reject these claims) because claims 6 and 18 recite that the high layer command from the host processing block, which is not on a real time basis, is embedded in hypertext. It is believed this limitation is not described by Humpleman, which was relied upon for this feature. While Humpleman describes hypertext, commands are not outputted from a host processing block in Humpleman to digital signal processing blocks. Rather, each home device in Humpleman contains HTML pages, and it is the HTML pages, not commands from a host, that provide the user with GUIs for commanding and controlling each home device (col. 4, lines 19-28 of Humpleman).

Furthermore, Humpleman states that each home device sends its custom GUI to the DTV, the latter also receiving HTML files from the home devices and these HTML files received by the DTV contain command information for the home device. Clearly, Humpleman does not describe the outputting of hypertext commands from the host to processing blocks, as recited by Applicants' claims 6 and 18. For this additional reason, the rejection of claims 6 and 18 should be withdrawn.

In the event the Examiner disagrees with any of statements appearing above with respect to the disclosure in the cited references, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner specifically indicate those portions of the references providing the basis for a contrary view.

Please charge any additional fees that may be needed, and credit any overpayment, to our Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-2, 6-14, and 18-25 are in allowable form; and this application is in condition for allowance. Early notice to this effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP
Attorneys for Applicants

By 
William S. Frommer
Reg. No. 25,506
(212) 588-0800